



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/729,362	12/05/2000	Itzhak Shoher	SHO-2000-4	3707

7590

12/19/2005

EUGENE LIEBERSTEIN
2151 LONG RIDGE ROAD
STAMFORD, CT 06903

EXAMINER

RIMELL, SAMUEL G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/729,362	Applicant(s) SHOHER, ITZHAK	
	Examiner Sam Rimell	Art Unit 2164	

All Participants:

(1) Sam Rimell.

(2) Eugene Lieberstein.

Status of Application: ____

(3) ____.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 14 December 2005

Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103(a)

Claims discussed:

6

Prior art documents discussed:

Howard

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant suggested that wireless keyboard and base station taken together did not constitute a single second location. Examiner did not agree. No specific agreement reached on this point. Examiner suggested claiming that the keyboard processing unit include a modem connected to a cellular telephone to permit the wireless communication. Applicant indicated that such proposal would be taken under consideration, but was not specifically agreed to. Examiner indicated that such proposal could be submitted as part of an RCE filing. .